



**Texas Department of Insurance**  
**Division of Workers' Compensation**  
Medical Fee Dispute Resolution, MS-48  
7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100 • Austin, Texas 78744-1609

## MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

### PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION

Requestor Name and Address:	MFDR Tracking #: M4-07-3644-01
SETON NORTHWEST HOSPITAL PO BOX 34868 SAN ANTONIO TX 78265-4868	DWC Claim #:
	Injured Employee:
Respondent Name and Box #:	Date of Injury:
Texas Mutual Insurance Co. Box #: 54	Employer Name:
	Insurance Carrier #:

### PART II: REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY AND PRINCIPAL DOCUMENTATION

**Requestor's Position Summary:** "75% total charges = fair & reasonable"

**Principal Documentation:**

1. DWC 60 Package
2. Medical Bill
3. EOB(s)
4. Total Amount Sought - \$6,688.10

### PART III: RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY AND PRINCIPAL DOCUMENTATION

**Respondent's Position Summary:** "Ingenix recommended to the Commission that a market reimbursement of 140% of Medicare's Hospital Outpatient Prospective Payment System (HOPPS) would meet the statutory requirements of Section 413.011(d)... Texas Mutual initially paid **\$1,437.4**, which is \$3,087.20 less than the Ingenix recommended MAR. Texas Mutual will issue a supplemental payment for this under separate cover."

**Principal Documentation:**

1. Response Package

### PART IV: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Date(s) of Service	Denial Code(s)	Disputed Service	Amount in Dispute	Amount Due
3/2/2006	W10, 894, 426, 97, 217, 713, W4, 891	Outpatient Surgery	\$6,688.10	\$0.00
<b>Total Due:</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>

### PART V: REVIEW OF SUMMARY, METHODOLOGY AND EXPLANATION

Texas Labor Code §413.011(a-d), titled *Reimbursement Policies and Guidelines*, and Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1, titled *Use of the Fee Guidelines*, effective May 16, 2002 set out the reimbursement guidelines.

This request for medical fee dispute resolution was received by the Division on February 8, 2007.

1. For the services involved in this dispute, the respondent reduced or denied payment with reason code:
  - W10 – NO MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE DEFINED BY FEE GUIDELINE. REIMBURSEMENT MADE BASED ON INSURANCE CARRIER FAIR AND REASONABLE REIMBURSEMENT METHODOLOGY.
  - 894 – FAIR AND REASONABLE REIMBURSEMENT FOR THE ENTIRE BILL IS MADE ON THE "O/R SERVICE" LINE ITEM.
  - 426 – REIMBURSED TO FAIR AND REASONABLE.
  - 97 – PAYMENT IS INCLUDED IN THE ALLOWANCE FOR ANOTHER SERVICE/PROCEDURE.
  - 217 – THE VALUE OF THIS PROCEDURE IS INCLUDED IN THE VALUE OF ANOTHER PROCEDURE

PERFORMED ON THIS DATE.

- 713 – FAIR AND REASONABLE REIMBURSEMENT FOR THE ENTIRE BILL IS MADE ON THE 'O/R SERVICE' LINE ITEM
  - W4 – NO ADDITIONAL REIMBURSEMENT ALLOWED AFTER REVIEW OF APPEAL/RECONSIDERATION
  - 891 – THE INSURANCE COMPANY IS REDUCING OR DENYING PAYMENT AFTER RECONSIDERATION
2. This dispute relates to outpatient surgical services provided in a hospital setting with reimbursement subject to the provisions of Division rule at 28 TAC §134.1, effective May 16, 2002, 27 TexReg 4047, which requires that "Reimbursement for services not identified in an established fee guideline shall be reimbursed at fair and reasonable rates as described in the Texas Workers' Compensation Act, §413.011 until such period that specific fee guidelines are established by the commission."
  3. Texas Labor Code §413.011(d) requires that fee guidelines must be fair and reasonable and designed to ensure the quality of medical care and to achieve effective medical cost control. The guidelines may not provide for payment of a fee in excess of the fee charged for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living and paid by that individual or by someone acting on that individual's behalf. It further requires that the Division consider the increased security of payment afforded by the Act in establishing the fee guidelines.
  4. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(A), effective December 31, 2006, 31 TexReg 10314, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 15, 2007, requires that the request shall include "a copy of all medical bill(s)... as originally submitted to the carrier and a copy of all medical bill(s) submitted to the carrier for reconsideration..." Review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the requestor has not provided a copy of the medical bill submitted to the carrier for reconsideration. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(A).
  5. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(E), effective December 31, 2006, 31 TexReg 10314, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 15, 2007, requires that the request shall include "a copy of all applicable medical records specific to the dates of service in dispute." Review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the requestor has not provided medical records to support the services in dispute. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(E).
  6. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(F)(i), effective December 31, 2006, 31 TexReg 10314, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 15, 2007, requires that the request shall include a position statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include "a description of the health care for which payment is in dispute." Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor has not provided a description of the health care for which payment is in dispute. The requestor has therefore failed to complete the required sections of the request in the form and manner prescribed under Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(F)(i).
  7. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(F)(ii), effective December 31, 2006, 31 TexReg 10314, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 15, 2007, requires that the request shall include a position statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include "the requestor's reasoning for why the disputed fees should be paid or refunded." Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor has not stated the reasoning for why the disputed fees should be paid. The requestor has therefore failed to complete the required sections of the request in the form and manner prescribed under Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(F)(ii).
  8. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(F)(iii), effective December 31, 2006, 31 TexReg 10314, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 15, 2007, requires that the request shall include a position statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include "how the Labor Code, Division rules, and fee guidelines impact the disputed fee issues." Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor has not discussed how the Labor Code, Division rules and fee guidelines impact the disputed fee issues. The requestor has therefore failed to complete the required sections of the request in the form and manner prescribed under Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(F)(iii).
  9. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(F)(iv), effective December 31, 2006, 31 TexReg 10314, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 15, 2007, requires that the request shall include a position statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include "how the submitted documentation supports the requestor position for each disputed fee issue." Review of the requestor's documentation finds that the requestor has not discussed how the submitted documentation supports the requestor position for each disputed fee issue. The requestor has therefore failed to complete the required sections of the request in the form and manner prescribed by Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(F)(iv).
  10. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(G), effective December 31, 2006, 31 TexReg 10314, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 15, 2007, requires the requestor to provide "documentation that discusses, demonstrates, and justifies that the amount being sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement in accordance with §134.1 of this title (relating to Medical Reimbursement) when the dispute involves health care for which the Division has not established a maximum allowable reimbursement (MAR), as applicable." Review of the submitted documentation finds that:
    - The requestor's rationale for increased reimbursement from the *Table of Disputed Services* states that "75% total charges = fair & reasonable."

- The requestor does not discuss or explain how payment of 75% total charges would result in a fair and reasonable reimbursement.
- The requestor did not submit documentation to support that the payment amount being sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement.
- The Division has previously found that a reimbursement methodology based upon payment of the hospital's billed charges, or a percentage of billed charges, does not produce an acceptable payment amount. This methodology was considered and rejected by the Division in the *Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline* adoption preamble which states at 22 *Texas Register* 6276 (July 4, 1997) that:  

“A discount from billed charges was another method of reimbursement which was considered. Again, this method was found unacceptable because it leaves the ultimate reimbursement in the control of the hospital, thus defeating the statutory objective of effective cost control and the statutory standard not to pay more than for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living. It also provides no incentive to contain medical costs, would be administratively burdensome for the Commission and system participants, and would require additional Commission resources.”
- The requestor did not discuss or explain how payment of the requested amount would ensure the quality of medical care, achieve effective medical cost control, provide for payment that is not in excess of a fee charged for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living, consider the increased security of payment, or otherwise satisfy the requirements of Texas Labor Code §413.011(d) or Division rule at 28 TAC §134.1.
- The requestor did not discuss or support that the proposed methodology would ensure that similar procedures provided in similar circumstances receive similar reimbursement.
- The requestor did not submit nationally recognized published studies, published Division medical dispute decisions, or documentation of values assigned for services involving similar work and resource commitments to support the proposed methodology.

The request for additional reimbursement is not supported. Thorough review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the requestor has not demonstrated or justified that payment of the amount sought would be a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement for the services in dispute. Additional payment cannot be recommended.

11. The Division would like to emphasize that individual medical fee dispute outcomes rely upon the evidence presented by the requestor and respondent during dispute resolution, and the thorough review and consideration of that evidence. After thorough review and consideration of all the evidence presented by the parties to this dispute, it is determined that the submitted documentation does not support the reimbursement amount sought by the requestor. The Division concludes that this dispute was not filed in the form and manner prescribed under Division rules at 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(c)(2)(A), §133.307(c)(2)(E), §133.307(c)(2)(F)(i), §133.307(c)(2)(F)(ii), §133.307(c)(2)(F)(iii), §133.307(c)(2)(F)(iv) and §133.307(c)(2)(G). The Division further concludes that the requestor failed to meet its burden of proof to support its position that additional reimbursement is due. As a result, the amount ordered is \$0.00.

#### **PART VI: GENERAL PAYMENT POLICIES/REFERENCES**

Texas Labor Code § 413.011(a-d), § 413.031 and § 413.0311  
 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307, §134.1  
 Texas Government Code, Chapter 2001, Subchapter G

#### **PART VII: DIVISION DECISION**

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code §413.031, the Division has determined that the requestor is not entitled to additional reimbursement for the services involved in this dispute.

#### **DECISION:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Authorized Signature

**Grayson Richardson**  
 Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer

**4/30/2010**  
 Date

## PART VIII: YOUR RIGHT TO REQUEST AN APPEAL

Either party to this medical fee dispute has a right to request an appeal. A request for hearing must be in writing and it must be received by the DWC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **20** (twenty) days of your receipt of this decision. A request for hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings, Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers Compensation, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744. **Please include a copy of the Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision** together with other required information specified in Division rule at 28 TAC §148.3(c).

Under Texas Labor Code §413.0311, your appeal will be handled by a Division hearing under Title 28 Texas Administrative Code Chapter 142 Rules if the total amount sought does not exceed \$2,000. If the total amount sought exceeds \$2,000, a hearing will be conducted by the State Office of Administrative Hearings under Texas Labor Code §413.031.

**Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.**